

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,490	11/17/2001	George Kindness		7843
25175	7590 05/10/2004		EXAM	INER
BROOKE SCHUMM III			COOK, REBECCA	
ONE NORT	H CHARLES STREET			
SUITE 2450			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BALTIMORE, MD 21014			1614	
			DATE MAILED: 05/10/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/997,490	KINDNESS ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Rebecca Cook	1614		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address		
Period for Reply	VIC CET TO EVOIDE AL	AONTHIC FROM		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a y within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO a, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 S	eptember 2003.			
· ·				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>17-25</u> is/are withdraw				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16 and 26-34</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority document				
2. Certified copies of the priority document				
 Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau 	- -	received in this National Stage		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		received		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)		
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 		

Art Unit: 1614

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants are requested to clarify the filing date of 60/245,592, since the filing date of 11/3/2000 is non consistent with PTO records.

Applicants request to amend claims 11, 12 and 13 could not be entered.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of celecoxib and atorvastatin in Paper dated 9/26/03 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that statins and COX-2 inhibitors are similarly acting compounds and are generally interchangeable. This is not found persuasive. A reference citing one 3-HMG COA reductase inhibitors or COX-2 inhibitors cannot be used against all 3-HMG COA reductase inhibitors or COX-2 inhibitor, respectively.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-16 and 26-34 are being examined to the extent that they read on the elected compounds. Claims 17-25 are withdrawn as not reading on the elected compounds.

OBJECTION

Claims 7-10 are objected to as improperly incorporating method steps into product claims. (MPEP 2116.01)

Art Unit: 1614

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-16, 26-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 14 the intent of the word "initially" is confusing. It is unclear whether other therapeutic changes are also expected.

In claims 4, 6, 9, 10, 15 and 30 the recitation "in at least one of said at least one carrier" is not understood.

In claims 12-13 and 33-34 it is not clear what the recitation "at least one dietary supplement to maintain adequate levels of Vitamin C, Vitamin E and Selenium means. Is the intent to claim Vitamin C, Vitamin E and selenium, or does the dietary supplement contain other compounds?

The intent of the phrase "prophyllactically effective amount" in the claims is confusing as to whether the intended use of the composition is to prevent or treat cancer, since the claims recite "treating" and "progression of cancer."

In claim 14 no administration step to an intended subject is recited. Furthermore, it is not clear what the intent is of the recitation "a therapeutically effective change in progression of cancer." Does it mean to prevent metastasis, shrink a tumor? It is not seen that the recitation is defined in the specification.

There is no formulation step is the method of manufacture of claims 29-34. The claims recite "incorporating in," but it is not clear what is incorporated into what.

Art Unit: 1614

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6,245,797 (Winokur).

Winokur (claims 46-49, claim 51-53, column 14, lines 55-56, column 23, lines 7-13) discloses a composition comprising an HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor and a COX-2 inhibitor and a method of combining the two inhibitors with a carrier. It further discloses that the HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor can be atorvastatin and the COX-2 inhibitor can be celecoxib. In the absence of a showing of unexpected results no unobviousness is seen in combining two compounds, the combination of which is taught in the prior art.

Claims 1-10, 14-16 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6,492,410 (Leopold) and MEDLINE AN 2001153392 (Gately) in view of 5,817,695 (Pellico).

Leopold discloses (column 3, lines 39-55, column 19, lines 33-36, column 20) that HMG CoA reductase inhibitors, including atorvastatin, are useful to treat cancer. Gately (abstract) discloses that COX-2 inhibitors are useful to treat cancer. Gately does not recite celecoxib, but applicants states in the Paper received 11/5/03 on page 2 that COX-2 inhibitors are generally interchangeable. Therefore, in the absence of a showing

Art Unit: 1614

of unexpected results it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine atorvastatin and celecoxib to yield the instant composition and use it to treat cancer.

Several of the claims recite a glutathione pathway enhancing and detoxifying compound that can be cystine. However, Pellico (examples) discloses that cystine is used in compositions given to people having cancer. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the cystine of Pellico to yield the instant composition comprising atorvastatin, celecoxib and cystine and use it to treat cancer, since each is taught to be used for the same condition. It would be inherent that it would have the recited properties of the claims (MPEP 2112.01).

Claims 29-31 differ over the references in reciting a method of manufacturing an anti-cancer combination comprising atorvastatin and celecoxib, with or without cystine. However, no unobviousness is seen in combining the compounds to yield a composition, since combining compounds useful to treat the same condition is well-known in the pharmaceutical art. Pellico (column 8, examples) and Leopold (column 14, lines 13-23) disclose mixing compounds useful to treat cancer.

Claims 11-13, 26-28 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6,492,410 (Leopold) and MEDLINE AN 2001153392 (Gately) in view of 5,817,695 (Pellico) as applied to claims 1-10, 14-16 and 29-31 above, and further in view of 6,630,157 (Horrobin), MEDLINE AN 20001266354 (Khuri) and CA134:146792 (Padayatty).

The claims recite that the composition contains lipoic acid, Vitamin C, Vitamin E and selenium. However, Horrobin (column 5) discloses that lipoic acid is used to treat

Art Unit: 1614

cancer; Padayatty (abstract) discloses that vitamin C is used to treat cancer and Khuri (abstract) discloses that vitamin E and selenium are useful to treat cancer. Therefore, it would be obvious to add lipoic acid, Vitamin C, Vitamin E and selenium to the composition comprising atorvastatin and celecoxib, with or without cystine, to yield the instant composition and use it to treat cancer, since each is taught in the art to be useful to treat cancer.

Additionally, no unobviousness is seen in combining the compounds to manufacture the anti-cancer combination for the reasons given above.

It is noted that MEDLINE AN 2001153392 and CA134:146792 issued in 2000. However, based on their issue number, it appears that they predate the instant priority date. The Examiner has ordered this information, which will be provided in the next Office Action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0571. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel, can be reached on (571) 272-0584.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Renee Pettus (571) 272-0547 in Customer Service.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1614

Rebecca Cook

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1614

April 29, 2004